

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 93 04:30:17 PDT  
From: Ham-Digital Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-digital@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Digital-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Digital Digest V93 #81  
To: Ham-Digital

Ham-Digital Digest                      Wed, 20 Oct 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    81

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Digital-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Digital Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-digital".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: 19 Oct 1993 16:24:20 +0100  
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!warwick!unicorn.nott.ac.uk!  
unicorn.nott.ac.uk!not-for-mail@ames.arpa  
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

References <29gm8v\$3e2@unicorn.ccc.nottingham.ac.uk>,  
<29nbddINN53t@network.ucsd.edu>, <1993Oct18.175712.29447@news.mentorg.com>not  
Subject : Re: Packet Standards

In article <1993Oct18.175712.29447@news.mentorg.com> Hank\_Oredson@mentorg.com  
writes:  
>In article <29nbddINN53t@network.ucsd.edu>, brian@nothing.ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor)  
writes:  
>|> There's been an ARFC (Amateur RFC) directory on UCSD for several years,  
>|> created when this subject last came up. So far there's nothing in it  
>|> because no one has written any yet.  
>|> - Brian  
>  
>Looked around ucsd.edu a bit, and could not find any "arfc"  
>directory. There \*are\* some standards documents (in particular  
>the bbs interchange document presently in process), but had not  
>the faintest idea where to put them.

The BBS interchange document looks really good, from what I've seen of it..  
The response I've had to my original postings about an RFC-type standards  
system for packet seem to indicate that:

- (a) The majority of people think it's a good idea (with the notable exception  
of a software author who certainly doesn't think it's a good idea)
- (b) A good name would be ARFC, along the lines of AX25..

Now, if people still think it's a good idea, we need to start working on a  
system to make it work. This group seems a decent enough place to do it, though  
if discussions get going we may well start up a mailing list for talking about  
standards.

I'd really like to hear suggestions. If you have a good idea about how it could  
work, mail me. More importantly, if you think it's a terrible idea then mail  
me, as I don't want to go about setting this up if people don't want it.. I'd  
like to check public opinion, and owing to the lack of top-level control in the  
world of packet, I'd consider the opinions of the readers of rec.radio.amateur.  
digital.misc to be as good a body to mandate it as anyone else.

Things that need to be worked on include..

- (a) Formatting standards - how are they published? Do we have Postscript or  
TeX available when possible as well as plain ASCII?
- (b) Peer review - Do we have reviewal procedures or are they unnecessary in  
the packet environment?
- (c) Copyright issues - Do authors have to relinquish all copyright or can they  
retain the copyright but make the document freely reproducible?

And much more..

73 Mike

```
--
+-----O  Mike Knell, University of Nottingham, UK  -+
|      Nevertheless..  -/ \- Internet: eeyimkn@unicorn.nott.ac.uk  |
|      the Turtle Moves!  -\_/- AX25: g7gpa@gb7bad.#23.gbr.eu  |
+--M.T.V. - GET OFF THE AIR!-- |  AMPRnet: mpk@hobbes.g7gpa.ampr.org  -----+
```

-----  
End of Ham-Digital Digest V93 #81

\*\*\*\*\*